

Remarks/Arguments:

Applicants' disclosure is directed to carryable memory media. The carryable media includes multiple directories at a directory level and a further directory at the directory level. Each of the multiple directories is limited to storing files of a respective file format. The further directory stores files in formats other than the respective file formats.

Independent claims 1, 6, 8 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Ando et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,341,196). Independent claims 49 and 52-57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Ando and Black et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,103,602). It is respectfully submitted, however, that the claims are patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth below.

Applicants' invention, as recited by independent claim 1, includes a feature which is neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record, namely:

...a plurality of directories at a directory level, each of said directories limited to storing files of a respective one of a plurality of file formats, so that not more than said respective one of said plurality of file formats are permitted to be stored in each of said directories...

...a further directory at said directory level, said further directory for storing files in other than said plurality of file formats...

(Emphasis added). In the exemplary embodiment described in Applicants' disclosure, this means that each one of the plurality of directories is limited to storing files having one format. Example directories are shown in the evidence appendix. As shown, a first directory can only store .doc files. A second directory can only store .xls files. A third directory can only store .xlm files. A fourth directory stores files having formats other than .doc, .xls and .xlm (e.g., .pdf, .tmp, etc.).

The Examiner argues that Ando teaches "a plurality of directories at a directory level, each of said directories limited to storing files of a respective one of a plurality of file formats." As support for the argument, the Examiner cites to Ando at column 5, lines 7-15, col. 17, lines 7-26 and FIG. 5.

The cited sections of Ando disclose a plurality of directories. Each of Ando's directories stores one respective category of data. By way of example, a first directory stores video information, a second directory stores still picture information and a third directory stores audio information. Exemplary rewritable video, video title, audio title and user-set sub-directories are shown in FIG. 5.

While Ando's FIG. 5 shows subdirectories that each store only one category of files, Ando's FIG. 5 also shows that files having different file types can be stored in the same subdirectory. For example, FIG. 5 shows three different file types stored in the rewritable video subdirectory (.ifo type files, .bup type files and .ob type files). Accordingly, while Ando discloses subdirectories that are each limited to storing one category of files, Ando does not disclose "a plurality of directories at a directory level, each of said directories limited to storing files of a respective one of a plurality of file formats, so that not more than said respective one of said plurality of file formats are permitted to be stored in each of said directories," as required by Applicants' claim 1.

Black does not make up for the deficiencies of Ando.

It is because Applicants include the feature of "a plurality of directories at a directory level, each of said directories limited to storing files of a respective one of a plurality of file formats," that the following advantages are achieved. A device (e.g., a telephone) may store in the memory media files having a format that the device recognizes and files having a format that the device does not recognize. A user may easily peruse the files thus stored.


Accordingly, for at least the reasons provided above, claim 1 is patentable over the art of record.

Independent claims 6, 8, 32, 49 and 52-57, while not identical to claim 1, include features similar to claim 1. Accordingly, independent claims 6, 8, 32, 49 and 52-57 are also patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth above.

Claims 3-5, 46 and 50-51 include all features of claim 1 from which they depend. Claims 12, 14-31, 44 and 47 include all features of claim 6 from which they depend. Claims 34-43, 45 and 48 include all features of claim 32 from which they depend. Claim 58 includes all features of claim 52 from which it depends. Thus, for at least the reasons provided above, claims 3-5, 12, 14-31, 34-48, 50-51 and 58 are also patentable over the art of record.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,518
Attorney for Applicants

LEA/nm

Enclosure: Appendix

Dated: September 2, 2008

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

NM309405

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

Directory
Level

	.doc
	.xls
	.xlm
	other formats (e.g. - .pdf, tmp, etc.)